	Application No.	**Applicant(s)**
Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	09/500,921	PESTONI, FLORIAN
	Examiner	**Art Unit**	
	Stephan F. Willett	2142	

All Participants:

Status of Application: *Allow*

(1) *Stephan F. Willett.*

(3) _____ .

(2) *Fred Gibb.*

(4) _____ .

Date of Interview: *24 October 2006*

Time: _____

Type of Interview:
☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant   ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes   ☒ No
If Yes, provide a brief description: .

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

Claims discussed:
1

Prior art documents discussed:
None

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:
See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

_____
(Examiner/SPE Signature)

_____
(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: On 10/24/06, I inquired into when the target lists are specified and what constituted a target list. The representative indicated that the specifying was done when generating and that the claims should be clarified, thus he proposed the attached amendment. The representative also explained the types of targets and the data sent and received by the targets.

Based on our previous discussion, on 11/2/06, I called the representative again. I explained how the generalized concept found in the metasearch engine references could read on the claims without citing a specific reference. Thus, based on our previous discussions of elements described in the applicant's specification, we agreed to add the elements of bufffering request until servers were avaiable and receiving user input to select target instances to further distinguish the claims.

On 12/29/06, we discussed further amendments to add the systems management program to explain how user input is processed as agreed in the attachment amendment and reflected in the examiner's amendment.